



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,514	10/25/2001	Rebecca Ann Frana-Guthrie	0212-0001	1677

33297 7590 06/27/2003

BEEM PATENT LAW FIRM
53 W. JACKSON BLVD., SUITE 1352
CHICAGO, IL 60604-3787

EXAMINER

CIRIC, LJILJANA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
10/053,514

Applicant(s)
Frana-Guthrie et al.

Examiner
Ljiljana V. Ciric

Art Unit
3743



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ljiljana V. Ciric (3) _____
(2) Michael Mischnick, Reg. No. 52,036 (4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 26, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No. If yes, brief description:
See attached draft of proposed amendments to claims 1, 3, and 6.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3, and 6 (cursory discussion only)

Identification of prior art discussed:
U.S. Patent No. 4,997,033 (issued to Ghiani et al. on March 5, 1991)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Agent Mischnick telephoned Examiner Ciric in order to discuss proposed draft claims 1, 3, and 6 in view of the prior art of record. More particularly, Agent Mischnick explained the proposed changes to claim 1 and how applicant feels these changes overcome the Ghiani et al. reference. Examiner Ciric noted that given that proposed claim 1 is broader in some ways than original claim 1, and given that no allowable subject matter had been identified in the previous Office action, no meaningful agreement could be reached until after an updated search and a thorough reconsideration of all of the pertinent issues have been made following submission of a formal amendment including arguments. Examiner Ciric recommended that Agent Mischnick contact the examiner for an interview a couple of weeks after filing a formal reply to the previous Office action. Agent Mischnick indicated that he would do so.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

LJILJANA V. CIRIC
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3743

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is
an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required